REMARKS

Examiner N. Ha is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject Patent Application. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been presented.

The Examiner is thanked for finding allowable Claims 9-12.

It is requested that should the Examiner not find the Claims to be allowable, that the amendment be entered for purposes of Appeal.

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 8, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102, as being anticipated by Blish et al is requested in view of amended Claim and in accordance with the following remarks.

It is agreed that Blish et al also forms a continuous conductive loop as a seal ring. The corner sections of Blish's seal ring may have different widths from all of the other sections. Blish states in col. 4, lines 36-37 and line 61 that the legs 122 of each section are "of similar width and length." Blish's seal ring is made up of sections that are placed perpendicularly to each other or in a zigzag fashion for the purpose of avoiding problems in filling the trench sections with metal (col. 3, lines 1-6). Applicants' seal ring sections have different widths so that adjacent sections will have different impedances (see top of page 7 of the Specification). Claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that each section has a different width from each adjacent section, as shown in the figures. On page 4 of the office action, the Examiner refers to Fig. 4 of Blish saying that the "sections protrude higher than the middle portion 104". This figure shows the silicon substrate 104 and the dielectric layer 102. The trench 122 has been cut through the dielectric layer 102. The trench is then filled with metal to form Blish's seal ring. The filled trench is the "section" of Blish's seal ring.

Claims 5 and 24 claim the conductive loop comprises a plurality of stacked, interconnected, conductive layers. This is clearly different from Blish in which the sections 122 are formed by depositing a single layer of metal within a trench and polishing back the

metal using CMP (col. 5, lines 10-30). Blish does not teach or suggest using multiple stacked interconnected conductive layers to form a seal ring.

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 8, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102, as being anticipated by Blish et al is requested in view of amended Claim 1 and in accordance with the remarks above.

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 2-3, 6-7, and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103, as being unpatentable over Blish et al is requested in view of amended Claim 1 and in accordance with the following remarks.

It is agreed that Blish could be modified to use one of the widths claimed in these claims. However, as discussed above, Applicants teach using at least two different alternating widths of their seal ring sections. Blish's sections all have similar widths and lengths, except possibly the corner sections. Thus, the alternating widths along the entire length of the seal ring is not taught or suggested by Blish.

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 2-3, 6-7, and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103, as being unpatentable over Blish et al is requested in view of amended Claim 1 and in accordance with the remarks above.

It is requested that should Examiner Ha not find that the Claims are now Allowable that the Examiner call the undersigned at 765 4530866 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Rosemary L. S. Pike. Reg # 39,332